

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 24/03/2025 7:01 PM from [REDACTED]

Application Summary

Address:	31 Manor Road Sole Street Cobham Gravesend Kent DA13 9BW
Proposal:	Demolition of existing lean-to structures. Erection of 2no. self build detached houses on land rear of no.'s 29 and 31 Manor Road with associated works. Proposed vehicle crossover. Installation of shared access drive and gates.
Case Officer:	Mr Ethan Bonthron

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	[REDACTED]
Email:	[REDACTED]
Address:	[REDACTED] Sole Street Gravesend

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	I am writing to strongly object to the above application. Whilst I am not against development of garden space per se, (indeed the house I live in is exactly that [REDACTED], this development is not in keeping with the area at all. All neighbouring properties (including mine) are either single storey dwellings or Chalet Bungalows, not two storey houses which will tower over all neighbouring properties. Setting aside the fact that the applicant is already in breach of the above application (see Notice of Breach submitted 24th March 2025) if this application is allowed to proceed I have serious concerns about the suitability of the access (having to demolish the side of one of the houses), which still, in my opinion does not leave sufficient width for a modern day fire engine to access. My understanding of planning law is that an access road needs to be a minimum of 3.7m kerb to kerb to accommodate a modern fire engine. This is supported by the London Fire Brigade on their public website. In this application, the width is 3.525m, as one of the houses chimney breasts juts into the drive. That is wall to wall as well - no room for mirrors etc. We have lived [REDACTED] to the applicant for in excess of 14 years, and throughout that time no maintenance to speak of has been carried out on the boundary between their property [REDACTED]. The fencing is in severe need of replacement on their boundary, with most of the posts rotted through. Thankfully half the boundary line is a brick wall, which [REDACTED] is continued to the rear of their garden and to the roadside as a condition of acceptance of a modified application, or any other application to ensure our security. One of the proposed dwellings (Plot 2) is 1.4 metres from [REDACTED] boundary line - which is why [REDACTED] would like continuation of the brick wall. What other planting and/or screening is the applicant proposing to ensure [REDACTED] privacy is maintained? There is nothing outlined in the application. The refuse and recycling storage area for Plot 2 is sited on [REDACTED] boundary, within 2 metres of an existing property. The smell during the summer months would be unacceptable. Previously, we were informed by the applicant that if they were to develop their garden space, then they would be seeking planning for a small house in their
-----------	---

garden for their elderly mother. This does beg the question why 2 four bedroom detached dwellings are needed? This is over developing the area of land available, and fails to take into consideration the peace and quiet currently enjoyed by their neighbours.

In conclusion, I consider this application firstly to be unviable due to the width of the access (3.525m, which as previously stated is wall to wall) and secondly the proposed dwellings are totally out of keeping with the area.

Kind regards